E. XXII. j 13

EPB/B
54520/B

1) WARREN, D.

2) WAITHMAN, R.

LETTER

TO THE

GOVERNORS

OF

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL,

Being a Refutation of the Invectives and Misrepresentations contained in a Letter from the Rev. Dawson Warren, Vicar of Edmonton, to William Mellish, Esq. M.P.

By ROBERT WAITHMAN.

"*Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee.*"
St Luke, chap. xix. ver. 22.

LONDON:

Printed for SHERWOOD, NEELY, and JONES, (successors to Mr. Symonds) No. 20, Paternoster Row; and to be had as published of all Booksellers, Newsmen, and other Dealers in Books, in every part of the British Empire.

BY JOHN ABRAHAM, CLEMENT'S LANE.

LETTER

TO THE

GOVERNORS

OF

CHRIST's HOSPITAL.

GENTLEMEN,

A PAMPHLET having appeared, addressed as a Letter to William Mellish, Esq. by the Rev. Dawson Warren, Vicar of Edmonton, the design of which evidently appears, by attributing to me the most malevolent views and unworthy motives, in my conduct, respecting the alledged abuses in Christ's Hospital, and also by the grossest misrepresentations and unfounded assertions to influence your minds in the investigation which is expected to take place relative to the claim which he may have for his son's admission into that most excellent institution; it becomes necessary for me, not so much for my own vindication, from the violent and unchristian-like aspersions which he has so coarsely endeavoured to cast upon me, as for the sake of truth and public justice, to expose the fallacies and self-contradictions he has advanced, by laying a plain statement of facts before the public.

While Mr. Warren sets out with saying, that this transaction "has been most scandalously misrepresented, and every exertion made that malice and falsehood could suggest, in order to draw a public odium on him and Mr. Mellish;" and that I have charged them with misconduct in a parochial affair, and made it a vehicle of political animosity against Mr. Mellish, and of enmity which he cannot account for against himself, it will be observed, that he has not, throughout his pamphlet, stated any one circumstance which can account for this enmity or bad motive with which he charges me; nor has he fairly met or refuted any of those statements which have publicly appeared, and which he represents as malicious falsehoods. "By me and my associates," he says, "himself and Mr. Mellish have been traduced in the Common-Council of the city of London, and villified in the public newspapers." "They have (he continues) circulated hand-bills round my parish, some anonymous, and some with various signatures. They have insulted me with the most scandalous anonymous letters, and even addressed such productions to my wife, for the base purpose I presume of endeavouring to embitter my domestic comfort." That Mr. Warren, who has been considered as the adviser of all those measures which have caused so much irritation in the parish, and whose conduct has been generally condemned for obtaining admission for his son into Christ's Hospital, may have received such letters, is probable. I have received some hundreds in my time, full of scurrilous abuse, and even threatening my life, for what I conceived an exercise of public duty; nay, once I had a bullet fired into my room, as if intended to carry such threats into execution. But surely he has no more right to impute such conduct to me, than I have to charge him with being the author of those I have received. Mr. Warren, it will be perceived, has here blended the parish proceedings with the proceedings respecting Christ's Hos-

pital. I can only say, that not a line has been written or spoken by me on either subject, that I would not avow in the face of all the world. As to the papers circulated in the parish of Edmonton, all those I had any concern in were published under the sanction of a Committee, appointed by a meeting of the parish at large, publicly convened; and I have publicly avowed them, and called upon those whom we opposed to disprove any part of their contents, which has not been done to the present moment.

That Mr. Warren should make such assertions without offering any thing by way of proof, or even assigning any probable conjecture as to a motive for such conduct, must appear strange for a person in his situation. That he should feel excessively hurt at the exposure of the transaction of his son's admission, is quite natural; but if all that had been stated was false, he might more than a year ago have taken a ready road to expose those falsehoods, and put his conduct in a fair point of view, to the disgrace and discomfiture of his adversaries. But, in such a case, to assign bad motives to them would have been unnecessary: it would have been sufficiently inferred from the facts themselves.

If, on the other hand, the statements are correct:—if Mr. Warren really is in the affluent situation described;—if he did come into the living at an unusually early time of life;—if he has opulent relations from whom he has large expectations, or who at least could assist him in planting his children in an eligible way to rise in life;—and if the charity of Christ's Hospital is designed for those objects which the certificate to be signed by the Minister and Churchwardens before a child can be admitted, does express, "*That they know of no probable means for the education of the said child, unless the governors of Christ's Hospital should admit him into*

the said Hospital;" and that Mr. Warren did himself improperly sign this certificate of his own son, and that he did further sign a petition to the governors, concluding with the following words: "*Therefore your petitioner humbly beseeches your worships,* IN YOUR USUAL PITY AND CHARITY TO DISTRESSED MEN, POOR WIDOWS, AND FATHERLESS CHILDREN, *to grant the admission of his child into Christ's Hospital, there to be educated* AMONG OTHER POOR CHILDREN."—If his friend Mr. Mellish really did sign the certificate, stating, "*I present the child mentioned in the certificate on the other side,* WHICH I BELIEVE TO BE A TRUE CERTIFICATE,"—I beg leave to observe, if these statements are true; if a year and a half have nearly elapsed since they have been publicly stated, and they have not during that time been contradicted, and Mr. Warren has been at the pains and expence of writing and sending to all the governors a pamphlet, for his own vindication and that of his friends, without controverting them:—if, I say, all these circumstances are true, they have much cause for anger with themselves; perhaps not a little cause for sorrow and contrition; but let them not hold me up as the author of their sufferings. "If their bed be a bed of torture, they have made it for themselves." No man will surely say, if the above facts are admitted, that the exposure of the affair (whatever may be the motives of the individual who brought them to light) is not at least highly beneficial to the community.

Men often run deeply into error, whose motives may nevertheless be very pure. It is not quite so common for men to do good acts out of evil motives; at least, Christian charity would impose it as a duty upon us not hastily to form such conclusions, without some probable cause or personal interest, none of which has the Rev. Gentleman assigned, nor can he against me. However, let the motive be what it may, which led to this disclosure: let it be bad, if he

pleases,—will that justify his conduct? Were he even to establish the fact of an evil motive, is his case thereby made out? If a man detects a housebreaker or a highwayman for the sake of a reward, or informs against him through malice, although it might affect the character and evidence of such person, it could not form the least justification of the criminal. I have never, to the present moment, had any quarrel with, or even incivility from Mr. Warren or Mr. Mellish: there can exist no motive for resentment against either of them. Did such a motive exist, it must be perfectly clear from the acrimony which he has displayed, that it would not have been overlooked by him.

The Rev. Gentleman utterly denies that I ever had any share in reconciling him with his parishioners: he denies ever having been at variance with them; therefore, "I could not join what never was separated." He states a dispute about ten years ago; but immediately after the sense of the parish was against him, he gave up his claim to take the chair in Vestry, and two gentlemen waited upon him to request him to name a day convenient for the parishioners to entertain him with a dinner. They did so: but here he lets it out, "*They resolved* (he says) *to defray every expence that the question had occasioned.*" Here he inadvertently contradicts himself: what were those expences? Why *law* expences; and yet *no dispute*.—I merely mentioned my taking a part favourable to Mr. Warren, without any view of magnifying my services on the occasion, in answer to insinuations that my conduct proceeded from personal enmity to him. But I must now briefly state, that there then was a contest with the parishioners. The Vicar of the parish appoints one of the Churchwardens: the other, appointed by the parishioners, opposed the Vicar's right to the chair. I was waited upon by Mr. Merrington, the Churchwarden appointed by the Vicar, then almost a stranger to me, and strongly soli-

cited to attend the Vestry, which I had never before done. Although I could not go the extent of vindicating his claim, I made every exertion on his behalf. The dispute continued a considerable time, first when Mr. Oliver was Churchwarden, and afterwards Mr. Erwood; and I have, within these few days, met a gentleman with whom Mr. Warren was on very friendly terms, to whom he expressed his obligations to me on that occasion, and said, he had felt it his duty to leave his card at my house, returning me thanks for my exertions; and now he says, that "when I presumed to state to the world, that he had been at variance with his parishioners, I uttered a libel upon him, and an insult upon them." Both the gentlemen who were then Churchwardens acknowledge the fact, and more—that it was at my suggestion that the dinner was had, and the Vicar invited, in order to terminate this dispute. I further say, that the Vicar could with difficulty give up his intention of legally prosecuting his claim, having served one of these gentlemen with a copy of a writ; and that I used much persuasion in the presence of the Churchwarden for that purpose. I have, by Mr. Warren's mistatement upon a matter of no importance to the public, been forced into these remarks.*

---

* When the dispute commenced, I do not know; but it appears by the minutes of Vestry, that Mr. Warren put in a formal claim to the chair on May 6, 1798, stating, that he had claimed it the Easter previous. These disputes continued until Oct. 25, same year; at which Vestry, although Mr. Warren invited all his friends by a public hand-bill, his claim was finally rejected, 72 against 50. It was at this time, that a reconciliation took place. Both parties dined together, and invited the Vicar. There had been nine different Vestries occupied

The late contest in the parish of Edmonton, into which the Rev. Gentleman has wandered and interwoven with matters so irrelevant, was certainly a contest of great importance, because it embraced two great principles, first, whether parish officers have an uncontrouled authority over the parish purse, and secondly, the power of denying to the parishioners, by refusing Vestries the right of examining the parish expenditure; but after the statements

---

mostly with this dispute. At all these Vestries, except the last but one, the decisions were against his claim, and on that occasion he had a majority of two, by means of the Churchwarden leaving the church to break up the meeting, and the Vicar's friend placing the other Churchwarden in the chair. I have several of Mr. Warren's letters to the Churchwarden now in my hands. I shall here insert one only, and a copy of his hand-bill, which will fully prove the existence of the dispute.

Dear Sir,

" As you see the *parish no longer take a part in* " *the contest with me*, you will not, perhaps, chuse to carry " it on as an individual. I write to you as a friend, to in- " quire your determination; of course I do not withdraw my " proceedings, unless my attorney's bill (amounting to some- " where about £10) is paid, which you have reason to expect " the payment of, from the order of Vestry, on the 14th of " June. I can, however, only look to you for it. If the " business drops here, I hope it will be the last difference of " opinion we shall ever have.

I am, Dear Sir,
Your faithful servant,
" D. Warren."

VICARAGE, Oct. 17, 1798.

already made, it can be little interesting to the public, and foreign to what I now have chiefly in view, to enter much into detail, but as the Rev. Gentleman has thought proper to make it a vehicle of misrepresentaion, I am in some measure forced to follow him through his different windings, at least so far as to point out some of his most palpable mistatements and self-contradictions.

I have already stated, that for the two first years I was in the parish, I never attended the Vestries but on the occasions I mentioned; from that time to the present, twelve years, I have never taken any concern in its proceedings, except when under the necessity of attending, while in the office of overseer; in which office, about three years ago, Mr. Mellish succeeded me: the business of the walls was first agitated while he was in office, and often since. I never once attended during all the discussions thereon: the parishioners had disapproved the measure; and so far from my being the instigator of these contentions, as the Rev. Gentleman represents, it is only about two months

---

" Sir,

" A Vestry, on Wednesday, the 17th instant, " by a majority of twenty-three to twenty-one, set aside the " law-suit, and re-established me in the chair of the Vestry, " as it had been occupied by my predecessors and myself. " This decission my opponents declare to be of no validity; " I therefore earnestly request your attendance at the Ves- " try on Thursday next, at eleven o'clock precisely, to con- " firm or annul the same.

" I am, Sir,

" Your most faithful servant,

" D. Warren."

Vicarage, Oct. 22, 1798.

ago I was waited upon and informed that the officers were carrying the plan into execution, and being solicited to put my name to a requisition for a Vestry to consider the propriety thereof, I immediately complied; at the same time not knowing the merits of the case, I did not pledge myself either to support or oppose the measure. The opposition, to their credit be it spoken, originated with some of the principal farmers; they have uniformly taken a more active part than myself, save and except, that, from the habit of occasionally speaking in public, I endeavoured publicly to give reasons for my conduct, more at large than others did.

Mr. Warren asserts, page 4, that I made a public charge against him of canvassing the parish, and using undue influence, which he denied, and I had not the manliness to retract, or say a word in explanation. Valiant Gentleman! He is like a man who lifts up his arm to strike, when he knows his adversary cannot get at him; he knows that his friend and benefactor, Mr. Mellish, who was in the chair, would not admit any one to speak twice, but to explain; now I had nothing to explain or retract—what I should have done, had I been allowed, would have been to prove, but even this was unnecessary, let Mr. Warren speak for himself, he will do it better than I. Turn to his own letter, in his own pamphlet page 18, where he says, "a long "printed anonymous paper, charges me with being the sup- "porter of those measures, really my power and influence "is very trifling, but such as they are, they certainly would "be exerted in favor of men who have done so much for the "parish;" here then he contradicts himself, which is true his present declaration, or his letter? He here does not disavow the use of his influence and power and only seems to lament that it is so trifling—What so trifling? in a parish where he

stands so well with his parishioners, and has never been at variance with them! this is another self-contradiction.

Mr. Warren has, commencing page 7, inserted a long account of the proceedings of the parish of Edmonton, which appeared in some of the public prints under the signature of A. B. which he positively asserts to be written by me, whether so or not I am sure he is completely ignorant of the matter, although he ventures at the unqualified assertion: I have before said, that whatever has been published, has been done under the sanction of a Committee; on that Committee were men more capable than myself of writing. I have, however, no hesitation in saying, it is a fair and just account of the proceedings, as far as so limited a space would admit, and that neither this paper, nor any other published by any of the Committee, contains any one assertion which has been disproved; and although the Rev. Gentleman has indulged in the common place invective, which we have heard on five-hundred occasions, about "the "anonymous defamer, who like the vile assassin stabs in "the dark, &c.;" he has no where shewn that such epithets would apply to any of the papers in question, any more than they would to the papers anonymously published by Addison or Johnson. He asserts, that, April 4, 1808, it was resolved in Vestry, "That no fence should be built at the back of the workhouse;" that, April 19, this negative was rescinded, and that in the statement alluded to it is said, "The parish-officers proposed to build a wall, "and the proposition was negatived." This must appear so despicable a quibble, one feels astonished the learned expounder should resort to it: does the rescinding of this negative, where *no wall is even mentioned, much less cells*, give sufficient authority to officers to *erect walls and cells* at the parish expence? It would be an unpardonable insult to the public to attempt to reason on such an absurdity:

The fact is, that every one concurred in the necessity of a fence to inclose an acre of ground adjoining the workhouse, but not a wall to extend only 50 feet.

Mr. Warren then goes back, page 14, to July 7, 1806, to shew that a vote then passed for the erection of a wall, but this advocate for truth forgets to tell you, that at the following Vestry this was negatived, now pray who misrepresents, this "dark assassin," A. B. or this friend of truth and light, Dawson Warren?

In the face of these minutes, he broadly asserts, page 15, "that the officers did nothing of themselves, and I knew it from these very minutes," which I have alluded to, although a requisition was signed by twenty-eight parishioners, a vestry refused, which the Vicar's letter, page 15, proves, and walls and cells have been contracted for, and the walls even finished.

In page 17 he refers you to this paper, signed A.B. in page 8, wherein it is stated, "that the Vicar had defined "these cells as intended for the insane and refractory, which "in the Vicar's words would supersede the necessity of "appeal to the magistrates: (to this he says) I *never have* "*written, printed or expressed, in any manner, directly or indi-*"*rectly, the ideas which it attributes to me, they are sentiments* "*which I never entertained or advanced, nor have the words* "*printed in italics ever appeared in any publication of mine, nor I* "*believe any where else, but in the jaundiced mind of the writer* "*of the letter, I therefore leave to my readers to characterize it by* "*what epithet they please.*"

Now this letter contains a mere extract of the proceedings, very much curtailed, to get it into the space convenient for its insertion in the paper, therefore any incorrectness in a

letter so published and anonymously signed, can never be subject to the same censure, if false, as the solemn asseveration of a gentleman exercising the most sacred functions. Let me then call your most serious attention to the following passage in Mr. Warren's own letter, published in his own pamphlet, and only over leaf, page 19, where he says, "*The other cell (if it must be so called) is intended as a place "of security for turbulent, dissorderly and refractory persons, who "are now obliged to be conveyed to the cage till the sentence of the "magistrates can be obtained,* BY THIS MEANS REFERENCE "TO THE MAGISTRATE MAY BE OFTEN AVOIDED.

Let me then appeal to every man of common sense, whether it is not in the above passage plainly avowed, that this is a place of confinement, converting the master of the workhouse into a jailor, and subjecting the wretched tenants of the workhouse to imprisonment at his will and pleasure, thereby superceding the law of the land, by which no man can be confined, otherwise than for safe custody until legally committed by a magistrate. What then can be said for the veracity of this Rev. Gentleman who solemnly asserts, in page 17, "*that he never has written, printed, or expressed in any manner,* DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, *the ideas which it attributes to him,*" and yet in page 19, he publishes his own letter to give a direct contradiction to his own solemn declaration; surely after such an instance of evident and gross self contradiction, it will be difficult to rely on any representation he may hereafter make.

In page 15, Mr. Warren states, that the writer of the said letter says, "that a requisition was presented to him, for a Vestry, which he refused," to which he says, "I am not the organ through which Vestries are convened, *I have no discretionary power of granting or refusing them, &c.*" He then, in page 16, inserts his letters in answer to the requi-

sition, and says, " that I held this letter in my hand, and " was commenting on part of its contents, that he called " upon me to read the whole, he was *universaly seconded* and " the chairman decided that it ought to be read, that I felt " myself for some minutes in a very awkard embarrassment, " that I knew the letter would condemn my conduct and jus- " tify his, and after much confusion, I said it did not suit my " purpose, and put it into my pocket,"

Never having felt the least animosity towards Mr. Warren, it is truly painful to me to point out the lamentable departure from truth, manifested throughout the above paragraph. In the first place let any one carefully read the letter, and discover, if he can, whether it contains any thing that can in the remotest degree condemn my conduct, or cause me any embarrassment, or does it justify him. Pray remark, that he has just above stated, " *that he had no power* " *to grant or refuse Vestries, that it was with the Churchwardens,*" does he tell us so in this letter? On the contrary, does he not say in this very *letter*, " *that the Churchwardens and myself* " *are of opinion it would be unnecessary to convene a Vestry imme-* " *diately*, but should the address sent round, be deemed un- " satisfactory, and should it appear the inhabitants are desi- " rous of a Vestry, I assure you, it will be a pleasure, as it " will *our duty*, to comply with that wish:" now it evidently appears he acted as if he had the power, and to refute him further, I have inserted in the note below, the copy of a notice sent by the Churchwarden himself, which he refused to be given out, and it is so marked on the back by the Vestry Clerk.* But observe in the next page, 17, he says,

---

*" Notice is hereby given, that a Vestry will be holden on " Tuesday, the 5th instant, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, " to take into consideration the measures to be pursued in

" that the parish officers have since handsomely and spon-
" taneously acknowledged that he did advise them to call a
" Vestry," what lamentable folly and contradiction! I will now ask, does this letter justify him, or does it criminate me? but this is not all I have to shew respecting this paragraph,—

" Thus bad begins, but worse remains behind."

I have now to assert what can be proved by a cloud of witnesses, that I did not either hold the letter in my hand, or comment upon it, nor did I act so foolishly as to say, " it did not suit my purpose, and put it in my pocket," the fact is, the letter was in my pocket, I was remarking on another printed letter, even that was not in my hand—the Vicar's friends raised a cry of read, during the clamour I made a pause until it subsided, took my papers out of my pocket, selected both the letters from a variety of papers, put them into the hands of the Vestry Clerk, stating, " that " I must go on in my own way, and allude to what I pleased " in my speech; if they desired the letter to be read, I had " no objection, it was the Vestry Clerk's business, and not " mine;" the letter I alluded to was accordingly read, and so far from my putting the other letter into my pocket, the Vestry Clerk has not returned it to me to this day.

With respect to embarrassment, it may happen to more expert speakers than myself, especially when contending

---

" consequence of the Rev. D. Warren, the Vicar, having
" commenced an action against Mr. Tho. Oliver, the Church-
" warden, in respect to the Vicar's claim of having a right
" to preside in all the parish meetings."

This was returned to Mr. Oliver, and written on the back:

" *Mr. Warren will not suffer this notice to be read in the*
" *Church.*"

against a weight of ability, but in this meeting for God's sake what was there to cause it? I had no one to contend against of that description; one gentleman after some convulsive struggles uttered a few unconnected sentences from his notes; and another travelled into his native country, Scotland, to prove that men could fight just as well without rights as with them; and a most learned proctor came prepared with a written reply to observations which took me above an hour in delivering; and this was all I had to contend against, except indecent and illiberal interruptions from the Rev. Gentleman's particular friends, whenever I touched on matters to which no rational reply could be made.

Mr. Warren has said, that these proceedings of the Vestry have been since rescinded,—he has forgot to tell you how, he has forgot to say that the most unwarrantable influence was used by his friends, over their tradesmen and tenants, to compel them to vote against the proceedings they had before adopted; but even this would not do, but by the intercession of Sir William Curtis, who came, as he said, to be a peace-maker. The Churchwardens came forward and totally disapproved the right they had assumed of expending the parish-money in erections, &c. and Sir William then promised to move a vote to that effect, if they would rescind their former proceedings; although this had an effect upon many, still upon a division there appeared 129 for the motion, and 113 against it; whereas on a former occasion, the numbers were 152 to 85, so that the matter was compromised, and a vote passed unanimously, confirming the principle, before contended for, against the Vicar and Officers.

Mr. Warren has throughout been a most unfortunate friend of Mr. Mellish. His letter, he states, was published

without his knowledge or consent; difficult as I find it to believe any thing coming from Mr. Warren, after what I have seen, I give him full credit for this assertion, for certainly no human Being could suppose, that Mr. Mellish would, if he could have prevented it, have suffered such a composition to come before the world; he has republished those proceedings and the vote of censure passed upon Mr. Mellish, thereby giving it greater publicity,—Without being able or even attempting to shew that the reasons specified in the motions are not founded in fact; if the fact be established, the world will judge whether the censure was well founded or otherwise. Mr. Warren indeed says, "that the gentleman insidiously denominated "the Curate, in order that it might appear that he was under "his influence, was minister of Southgate Chapel, a highly "valuable and respectable character." Whilst I totally deny that it ever was intimated that this Gentlemen was insidiously represented as under the influence of Mr. Warren, I bear full testimony to his character and respectability. His vote was objected to on public ground, not having ever been rated, whilst others had been rejected not under the same circumstances, but because they had not paid up what had never been demanded of them. This worthy gentleman, the Curate, a most deserving man, has had one son, as I am informed, placed in Christ's Hospital. His subsistence, I believe, depends chiefly upon the good will and esteem of the inhabitants, and does not amount to above a sixth part of Mr. Warren's income, whilst, I believe, he has a much larger family. It is, therefore, to be lamented, that it did not occur to Mr. Mellish, that his claims to have another son placed there, were superior to those of Mr. Warren; or, that even Mr. Warren, so strongly impressed with a sense of his worthiness, did not recommend him, as a fitter object than himself.

Mr. Warren states, " that the authorities then produced appeared to prove that he was entitled to give his vote;" " but (says he) with regard to the votes disallowed by you, as none of them are distinctly specified, I have *no observation to make on them.*"

Curious indeed! Now the authority referred to by Mr. Mellish, was Burn's Justice. Any one may turn to that book, by which it will be seen, the Curate had no right to vote: by the same authority, the parishioners objected to, had a right to vote. This the Vicar well knew, although he says, " *He has no observation to make on them*". For he was present at the close of the poll, when Mr. Mellish confessed himself in the wrong, and stated that he had consulted three magistrates, who decided against him. How then can he so mistake facts? In what intricacies and perplexities does he not involve himself and Mr. Mellish! I shall certainly never go out of my way to animadvert on the conduct of Mr. Mellish. Every man who comes before the public is open to observation. This is a privilege which has been freely exercised against myself, and I do not object to it: it has never given me any concern; but I shall ever exercise the same freedom towards others when occasions call for it, although I trust I shall never step aside to make a personal attack upon any one.—With Mr. Mellish, in this affair, I have done. The facts respecting him have been publicly stated: they have not been denied; and whether they amount to a justification or crimination of his conduct, the world must judge.

I now come to the most important part of my design,—the consideration of the alledged abuses in Christ's Hospital, as stated by me, and as affecting Mr. Warren, as well also as his observation thereon. The matter was first brought before the public, by the following letter, dated August 20th.

"A GROSS ABUSE OF PUBLIC CHARITY.

"*To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.*

"SIR,

"I Think it highly important to state to the public, through the medium of your Paper, a circumstance which I conceive to be a most gross and scandalous perversion of one of the most noble and useful institutions in this or in any other country, and which, I conceive, cannot fail strongly to interest the feelings and excite the indignation of every reader. The institution I allude to, is Christ's Hospital. Some other charities may be liable to objections; but Christ's Hospital was intended, and is peculiarly calculated, for those who have an irresistible claim upon us—the support and education of the children of persons who have lived in a respectable situation in life, but who, either by the death or the misfortunes of their parents, are become destitute of the means of support and education suitable to their former situation and expectation. This noble institution, however, is, I fear, greatly perverted from its true and original intention, and children are frequently placed there, whose parents are not only capable of maintaining and educating them, but possess the ample means of handsomely providing for them afterwards, to the exclusion of those pitiable objects for whom it seems peculiarly designed. For one such object, whose parents, from a respectable station and better prospects, are now become wholly dependent upon the bounty of their friends, I have in vain sought for a presentation: whilst anxiously making unsuccessful applications for this poor youth, what must have been my astonishment to find *that the Rev. D. Warren, the Vicar of Edmonton, whose living is known to be upwards of £ 1200 per annum, had a son placed, within these few days, in that charity.*—Judge, Sir, what surprise and astonishment such a circumstance must have created among the parishioners, who have been

accustomed to hear him most devoutly and pathetically exhorting them liberally to contribute towards supporting the fatherless and widow. How, it will be asked, if the Rev. Gentleman could descend to the meanness of accepting, could any govenor so demean himself to bestow upon him a presentation?—Where, for God's sake, could the man be found? Why, Sir, to our further astonishment, such a man was found in Mr. Mellish, the Member for Middlesex; and, no doubt, Sir, he has been actuated by the most pure and honourable motives. No services rendered to Mr. Mellish, during the late Middlesex election, could have influenced his independent, patriotic, discriminating mind; nor can it be imagined, that the pious Vicar could have grounded his pretensions upon any such services; yet, Sir, one would imagine that, during Mr. Mellish's active canvass throughout the populous county of Middlesex, he must have seen poverty in various shapes; have entered many a miserable dwelling; seen many a distressed and reduced family, who might have solicited his bounty in a way more powerful than words; and that he might have had an occasion of bestowing his presentation, where it might have been full as creditable to his character, and, one would suppose, as satisfactory to his feelings.

"*An inhabitant of Edmonton and freeholder of Middlesex.*"

Edmonton, August 20, 1807.

I am charged with bringing this matter forward as a party business.—Has the charge been made out? Has any probable cause been assigned? Certainly not.—I never received any offence from Mr Mellish: I never came into political contact with him. During the two Middlesex elections in which he was concerned, I voted but at one; and on both occasions, never solicited a single vote. When the affair respecting the presentation of Mr. Warren's children, was first mentioned in the parish, all my neighbours spoke

of it with indignation, even those who had been in the closest intimacy with the Vicar, and always supported Mr. Mellish in his contests for the county. I was almost the last to believe it: I would not fully credit it even after a respectable neighbour told me he had seen the boy in the school dress. I desired a friend of mine, who was a governor, to ascertain the fact, and he dissipated all my doubts on the subject.

I have already stated, that I have never yet published a line that I should be afraid to avow.—It would appear ostentatious in me to sign my name to any communication I might occasionally make to a public newspaper. The above letter was near a month in the editor's hands, previous to publication. I was from town part of the time: and the case appeared to him so flagrant, that, until he had undoubted proof of its truth, he would not admit its insertion. The Rev. Gentleman called at the office in a rage, and insisted upon having the author given up, and asked the editor how he dared to publish it. "Because (he replied) it was a shameful and flagrant abuse of a most noble charity; that he believed it to be true, and, as a man and a Christian, he was bound to make it public; and can you deny it, Sir?" The Rev. Gentleman lowered his tone; said his income was overstated, and he only wished to call upon the author to explain circumstances to him, as he had no doubt the publication had proceeded from a good motive. The editor said he would mention it to the author; in the mean time, he would publish any thing the Rev. Gentleman thought proper to state in contradiction. When I saw the editor, I said, as I conceived it was mere curiosity to find out the author of the letter, it might be as well not to satisfy him; but he might do as he thought proper: I did not care if all the world knew it. It has, however, been perfectly well known throughout the parish, that I was the author, and I have never disavowed it.

A considerable period having elapsed, and the above letter, which had excited very general attention, having neither produced inquiry, nor induced the Rev. Gentleman to withdraw his son, the following letter was published, explaining more fully the nature of of the transaction, and the rules and orders of the Hospital.

" GROSS ABUSE OF PUBLIC CHARITY.

" *To the Editor of the MORNING CHRONICLE.*

" SIR,

" IN a Letter, addressed to you, and published on the 20th of October last, I brought to public view a gross and scandalous perversion of that most excellent charity, Christ's Hospital; that letter, I am happy to find, has excited a very general interest in almost every circle, and I am concerned to add, from the various instances which I have heard related, such abuses are by no means uncommon, not only in that, but other Charities—That abuses of equal enormity may have occurred, I entertain no doubt, but such instances do not at all palliate, much less excuse, the persons implicated in that transaction; on the contrary, they render the conduct of those who have the direction of the concerns, still more reprehensible, and an enquiry into the management of these public Institutions still more necessary. The case I have stated certainly acquires considerable atrocity, from the rank, character, circumstances, connections, and situation in life of the parties; Mr. Mellish, the enlightened Member for the county of Middlesex, presenting to a Charity designed for the Children of " poor distressed Men, Widows, and Fatherless Children," the son of the Rev. Dawson Warren, the Vicar of Edmonton, whose living is estimated at more than 1200l. per ann. brother-in-law to Mr. Jackson, our late Minister at Berlin, Copenhagen, &c. besides being related to persons of opulence, from whom he has large

expectations—and all these circumstances known to Mr. Mellish, having large property in the same parish, where he lately served the office of overseer. In order, Sir, that you and the public may form a correct judgment of the conduct of these persons, and be enabled to form an opinion of the enormity of such abuses, I shall now refer you to some of the regulations agreed to, at several general courts of the governors of Christ's Hospital, together with the form of petitions, certificates, &c. required with presentations, which are selected from printed copies published by themselves:—

The fifth regulation, after excepting the children of livery servants, such as are lame, &c. says, "*That no "children who have any probable means of being otherwise "provided for, shall be taken into the charge of this Hos-"pital, on any account, or by any presentation whatever; "and if any such shall happen to be admitted, and afterwards "found disqualified in some or one of these instances, they shall "be immediately sent home to their parents, or to the parishes "from whence they came.*"

Sixth regulation—"That none be admitted without a "due certificate from the *Minister*, Churchwardens, and "three or four of the principal inhabitants of the parish "from whence such children come, *certifying the poverty "and inability of the parent (if any be living) to maintain "and provide for such children.*"

Seventh regulation—"To prevent children being ad-"mitted contrary to the said rules, they shall be presented "to a general court, who will examine into the *truth of "the certificates, vouchers, testimonials*, &c. or refer the same "to the committee of almoners, *strictly to examine, whether "the allegations contained in each separate petition and presen-*

" *tation be true, and conformable to the right of the presentor* " *and the above regulations, and all such as shall be found* " *otherwise, shall be rejected.*"

" Now, Sir, having stated so much of the regulations as will shew who the proper objects of that charity are, and what the conduct of the governors ought to be, I shall next give you the form of a petition, which the parent (if any) is required to sign, before the child can be admitted:—

" To the governors, &c.

" The humble petition of ——— humbly sheweth, that " the petitioner" (here is a blank left for a description of the situation and circumstances of the petitioner; and then it concludes with the following prayer)—" *therefore* " *your petitioner humbly beseeches your worships, in your usual* " *pity and charity to distressed men, poor widows, and fatherless* " *children, to grant the admission of his child into Christ's* " *Hospital (blank left for age and name) there to be educated* " *among other poor children.*"

" ! ! ! A very pretty petition, Sir, for a man to sign who has 1200l. per ann.; but this is not all, for the *Minister*, (in this case himself) Churchwardens, and three *principal* parishioners, are required to sign a certificate, wherein, after describing the age of the child, that he was born in the parish, " is not maintained at the parish charge," they declare, " *that they know of no probable means for the education* " *of the said child, unless the governors of Christ's Hospital* " *should admit him into the said Hospital.*"

" Then, Sir, to crown the whole, you will see, by the following declaration, which the person presenting a child is required to make at the back of the above certificate, what sort of a task Mr. Mellish had to undergo—" *I*

" *present the child mentioned in the cereificate on the other* " *side, which I believe to be a true certificate! the Christian* " *and surname being inserted in full length, according* " *to order of court, &c. Witness my hand, this* " ——— day of ———." All these testimonials to prove the Vicar of Edmonton a poor distressed man, without any probable means of educating his own son: it never once occurring to these sagacious persons, that the Vicar was qualified, and had leisure (which is not often the case with others) to instruct his own son, and even other children, as many clergymen are obliged to do, had his circumstances not allowed him conveniently to pay for his education.

"How, it may be asked, could the committee of governors, consistent with their duty and the important trust reposed in them, admit of the presentation in this case? It may be alledged, that they were imposed upon. If so, now the fact is brought to light, why is not the child returned to its parents agreeably to their own orders and regulations! But, I fear, such abuses are too frequent to admit of the plea, I shall, at present, forbear to mention several I have heard related; but it is rather a curious circumstance, that one of the Churchwardens in the same parish has had two sons in the charity, one of whom is, I believe, there now. Judge then, Sir, when our pious Vicar calls upon us to exercise our "*pity and charity for distressed men, poor widows, and fatherless children*," and this Churchwarden holds the plate at the church-door—what pity and compassion it must excite amongst us!

"From the evident impression which this shameful transaction has made on the public mind—from the reprobation it has met with in almost every company—and the honest indignation which has been expressed by several governors of the charity, I am induced to hope, that the exposure of

so barefaced a perversion of so noble an institution, whereby helpless infants are deprived of the means of support and education, which the patrons thereof so clearly intended for those distressed objects, will lead to such a serious inquiry as may produce a speedy and salutary reformation; for if such abuses are suffered to continue, no man can hereafter leave his property to any charitable institution, where he can be assured it will be applied for the purposes bequeathed. I call most seriously upon the governors at large, "*in their pity and charity for distressed men, poor widows, and fatherless children*," immediately to institute an inquiry, and rescue the charity from such a misapplication of its funds. Should my humble endeavours contribute toward effecting so necessary a reformation, I shall deem myself highly fortunate in awakening the public attention to an object of so much interest and importance.

"I am, Sir,

"*An inhabitant of Edmonton,*

"AND

"*Freeholder of the County of Middlesex.*"

Edmonton, Nov. 10, 1807.

This letter producing no effect, I gave notice of the following motion in the Common-Council; which, owing to an accumulation of prior notices, remained on the paper nearly a year before it came under discussion. At length, it was discussed in a very full Court, and carried unanimously.

ANSLEY, MAYOR.

"*A Common-Council, holden in the Chamber of the Guildhall of the City of London, on Thursday, the 3d day of November*, 1808.

"Resolved unanimously, That a statement having been made in this Court, by one of its members in his place, of

a gross abuse in the presentation and admission of children into Christ's Hospital, contrary to the rules, orders, regulations, and benevolent purposes of that charity: this Court are of opinion, that it is highly necessary, as well for the honour of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Commoners, and other governors of the said Hospital, as for the future good government thereof, that an immediate inquiry should be made respecting the same. They do therefore request the several members of this Court, who are governors *ex officio* of the said Hospital, to request Sir John-William Anderson, Bart. Alderman, and President of the said Hospital, to convene as early as possible a General Court or Meeting of the governors at large, for that purpose; and also to inquire whether any other similar abuse exists, in order effectually to remedy the same, and adopt such measures as may prevent the recurrence of such abuse in future."

WOODTHORPE.

It ought not to escape remark, that Mr. Warren has found it convenient to jump over these two letters entirely. He has neither denied nor disputed a single fact: he has never once alluded to the orders and regulations of the institution, to the form of petitions, certificates, &c. In page 22, he commences with empty invectives upon the proceedings in Common-Council, and alternately goes from them to the poor-house, and the poor-house to himself, intermixed with stale, dry, worn-out observations about new philosophy to page 37; which, as it has no reference either to the subject, or any thing ever written or spoken by myself, I shall pass over for the present.

His whole pamphlet contains forty-eight pages. In page 37, as if recovering from a trance, and forgetting what he has been before upon, he commences his observations concerning his son's admission. I shall therefore follow him;

and return however occasionally to notice some remarks he has before made on this subject.

He there says, " He is now come to a subject which has been so violently and wrongfully introduced, and agitated in the Common-Council of the metropolis,—that of having obtained, from the friendship of Mr. Mellish, a presentation for his eldest son for Christ's Hospital;" and states, " that it is misplaced and impertinent for any individual to busy himself with the private concerns of another, will not be disputed." Without following him throughout his observations, I shall select such only as seem to require notice. Speaking of me, he says, " What right this person has had to avail himself, for this purpose, of his situation in the Common-Council," he will not stop to inquire; but intimates, that the Common-Council have no such right; and that " the governors at large will not sanction such an interference with their rights".

It would have been more decorus and satisfactory, had Mr. Warren, instead of questioning the right of interference, confined himself to shew, that his son was a fit and proper object, and that the principles of the institution were not violated by his admission.

I will, however, endeavour to give him some very plain reasons why such a right exists; and, before I have done, I hope, plain and satisfactory reasons why he has no claim upon the charity, and that his son's admission was a most gross and shocking abuse.

In the first place, it might be observed, that the public have an interest in every public institution. They are established for the general good; and if perverted from the benevolent intentions of the founders, every individual has a

right to expose such abuse. The community is bound to provide for its poor, helpless, and distressed members; and if the institutions established for the express purpose of educating and maintaining "fatherless children," or the children of "distressed men and poor widows," and, as the certificate states, where "there is no probable means for educating such child,"—are so perverted, and these distressed objects thrown upon the world to make room for the children of the opulent, or of those in easy circumstances, it must be obvious to every one, that additional burthens are thrown upon the community. It therefore becomes, in my mind, the duty of every man, according to his abilities, to expose these transactions.

Besides which, it can hardly be out of the contemplation of any one, although he may not have occasion himself to make a call upon such a charitable fund, that some of his relations or posterity may have a fair and just claim to its benefits. To such reflecting minds, what consolation must it be, that there are in this country such provisions; and what emotions must arise upon the consideration, that these sources are diverted from their proper channel; and that the "helpless child of want" must be consigned to beggary, to make way for the children of the opulent. But the Rev. Gentleman may think this mode of reasoning too refined: it savours too much of the new philosophy.

Does he not know that a more direct right exists? Does he not know that the government of Christ's Hospital down to the year 1782, belonged to the corporation of London, and the sole management thereof was vested in them by charter?* That if the corporation in part relinquished their

* In Maitland's History of London it may be seen, that king Henry VIII. granted to the City, Gray Friars, within

right of governing, by entering into an agreement, since

Newgate and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, " for relieving and succouring *their poor*." He then states, that the King founded two churches on these places; the one Christ Church, and the other Little St. Bartholomew: " so according to that his grant, it *lay upon the City to establish here a standing provision for the poor;* and accordingly, some part of the scite of Gray Friars *they purchased*, for a large Hospital for *poor fatherless children*," here to be decently maintained, and piously brought up and fitted for trades and callings."

" 1552. The Lord Mayor and citizens fell upon the reparation and fitting up the Friars for the reception of the children, and they effected it in the same year, and called it CHRIST'S HOSPITAL. So that in the month of September, they took near *four hundred orphans*, and clothed them."

From this origin arose that great charitable institution, under Edward VI, who being (as appears by the same authority) impressed by a sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, " on mercy and charity," did not quit the church till he had consulted with the Doctor on the best means of relieving the poor distressed. The King wrote to the Lord Mayor the same day, and sent it by the Doctor, " signifying, that it was his special request, and express commandment, that the Mayor should assist therein." The Lord Mayor, assisted by certain aldermen and commoners, after various consultations, digested certain plans for the relief of the poor, which were laid before the King, and approved of. Then was founded this Hospital, and richly endowed by the King, who thus expressed himself on the occasion: " Lord I yield thee most hearty thanks that thou hast given me life thus long, to finish this work to the glory of thy name." The object of this institution of Christ's Hospital, was for " the poor by *impotency*," viz. " *the innocent and fatherless*," where poor

ratified by act of parliament, that such agreement was for

---

children are trained up in the knowledge of God and some virtuous exercises, to the overthrow of beggary."

"Every governor on being admmitted, hath this charge solemly given in the presence of the president and governors assembled in court:

"Worshipful ———

"The cause of your repair hither, at this present, is to give "to you knowledge that you are elected and appointed by the "Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen to the office, charge, "and governance, of Christ's Hospital.

"And, therefore, this is to require you, and every of you, "that you endeavour yourselves, with all your wisdom and "power, faithfully and diligently to serve in this vocation and "calling, *which is an affair of high trust and worship; for ye "are called to be the faithful distributors and disposers of the "goods of* ALMIGHTY GOD TO HIS POOR AND NEEDY MEMBERS; in the which office and calling, if you shall be found "negligent and unfaithful, ye shall not only declare yourselves to be the *most unthankful and unworthy servants of "Almighty God, being put in trust to see the relief and succour of his poor and needy flock*, but also, you shall shew "yourselves to be very notable and great enemies to that work "which most highly doth advance and beautify the commonwealth of this realm, and chiefly of this *City of London.*

"These are, therefore, to require of you, and every of "you, that ye here promise before God, and this assembly of "your fellow governors, faithful to travail in this your office "and calling, that this work may have its perfection, and "that the needy members committed to your charge be diligently and wholesomely provided for, as you will answer

the benefit and good government of the charity?* And if the corporation now find it misgoverned, and its funds misapplied, will he contend that any interference on the part of the corporation is impertinent? Does he not know that by applying to parliament, and shewing where the

---

" before God at the hour and time when you and we shall
" stand before him, to render an account of our doings; and
" promising this to do, you shall be now admitted into this
" company and fellowship."

By these extracts it will be seen, what claim the citizens of London have on this institution; how it has been perverted; and how far this solemn charge is adhered to.—Let the Rev. Gentleman carefully look at these documents, and then say whether he has as fair a claim as any other.

* An agreement was entered into between the corporation and the governors of Christ's Hospital, which was confirmed by an Act of Parliament passed in 1782; wherein the right of the corporation is thus stated:—" Whereas the management
" and government of the said Hospitals, and any and every of
" them, and the several rights, revenues, and possessions
" thereof, respectively were vested in the said Mayor and
" Commonalty, and the Citizens of London, and their succes-
" sors, by several charters or letters patent, bearing date re-
" spectively the 30th day of January, in the 38th year of the
" reign of King Henry VIII. and 26th day of June, in the
" 6th year of the reign of King Edward VI. with such powers,
" rights, and privileges, to such uses and purposes, and sub-
" ject to such restrictions, limitations, and trusts, as in the
" said charters and letters patent are contained, &c." The Act then states the mode of admitting other governors from time to time; the benefit arising therefrom, by the voluntary contributions of such governors; and that was conceived to be for the mutual benefit of the said Mayor; and that all dis-

right was formerly vested—for what purpose it was in part relinquished—and that a misgovernment had since prevailed—a remedy might be obtained? Or even by application to the chancellor? Can the Rev. Gentleman be ignorant that the establishment was principally intended for the sons of decayed citizens, who were liable from the very nature of trade to be suddenly precipitated from affluence into indigence? He also might have known, what I believe to be a fact, that the citizens do contribute towards its funds, by taxes annually imposed on carts, &c. besides the property originally vested in them.

What claim has he then who is not a citizen of London? He who is represented, and I believe truly, to have an income of 1200l. per annum, with rich relations, from whom he has large expectations, and three very near rela-

---

putes should be settled; "and that the actual ordering, management, and government, of the said Hospitals respectively, shall for ever hereafter be continued in the Mayor and Aldermen of the city, together with the other persons now acting as governors, or hereafter to be elected as such in the usual mode of election of governors of the said respective Hospitals, and such of the commoners of the said city as shall be elected and chosen in the manner hereafter to be hereby directed, *with such powers, rights, and privileges, to such uses and purposes, and under and subject to such restrictions and trusts as are in the said charters and letters patent, and hereinafter in these articles expressed and contained.*"

In this Act, the right of the city of London is fully recognized. The Hospital Seal is in the custody of the Chamberlain of London; and they cannot grant a lease without coming to the court of Common-Council, nor sue or be sued but in the name of the corporation; all which is provided in the Act.

tions holding lucrative situations under the government!* Do not we contribute sufficiently out of our parochial and national taxes towards the maintainance of his family, but he must also obtrude himself on our public charities? And while he is putting into his pocket his large income, are his children to be educated and maintained at the public charge? Why am I under the necessity of enforcing these considerations upon the Rev. Gentleman? It is more his duty than mine to inculcate such doctrines: his sacred function requires it of him: every principle of religion and morality ought to prompt him to it.

In page 39, the Rev. Gentleman says, "It is stated that no man before me, having such an income as I have, had ever succeeded in getting a presentation for a child: who would not believe, from the boldness and mock solemnity with which this assertion was brought forward, that it must be true?" He then denies the truth; and, in support of the denial, refers to the list of children at present in the Hospital, and the character and situation of the children, and thus continues: "*I assert, that I have as fair a claim as every man upon those lists, and that my child,* ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT PRACTICE *and spirit of the Institution, is a fit and proper object of this charity.*"

It is with infinite regret that I am all along under the necessity of pointing out the deviations from truth in this pamphlet. It has never been asserted by me, or any other to my knowledge, that no other man with the same income ever succeeded in getting a child into that charity; directly the contrary is stated in my letter page 21, on the

---

* Mr. Warren has a brother, and his wife two brothers, who hold lucrative situations under Government: whether he has any other relations quartered upon the public, I know not.

contrary, when urged to confine my motion to this case only, I expressed (what did not look like enmity to him) my belief that there existed abuses equally flagrant. Yet, I believe, there are some circumstances more aggravating in this case than most others. Although I believe my information to be correct, I wish to avoid stating any thing which does not come within my own knowledge; a boy, however, of the name of Carrysfort Proby, has been admitted since Mr. Warren's son, under the presentation of Sir George Baker, Bart. I will ask whether his father has not two livings, Brewood and Litchfield, in Staffordshire, of the value of 700l. per annum, besides his own and wife's fortune? Whether the boy is not nephew to Lord S—f—th, and first cousin to the lady of Sir S—— H——d: whether he is not cousin to the Earl of C—ys—t, whether his mother is not sister to a boronet, &c. &c.?——

But let other abuses be ever so flagrant, what can they avail him? Can any thing account for the perversion of human reason which the Rev. Gentleman displays by this mode of self-justification? Instead of describing to us the true nature of the institution;—instead of denying those rules and regulations alledged to exist, and which, if existing ought to have excluded his children;—instead of shewing that his circumstances have been misconceived or misrepresented, and that his children came fairly within the rules of the institution;—he merely justifies the deed by telling us, the rules have been violated in other instances; that there are other cases as bad or worse than his own; and if other children are so admitted, his have a right also. By this mode of reasoning, any improper act or crime might be justified by the frequency of commission. What would the Rev. Gentleman say, if, when he was admonishing one of his parishioners for getting drunk every Sunday afternoon, the offender should say, "Oh! Sir, this is nothing: it is a very common thing among your parishioners; nay, Sir, several get drunk on the Sunday morning?"—Would not the Rev. Gentleman

say, these instances of misconduct do not justify you; on the contrary, if the evil is got to such a height, there is the greater reason to put a stop to it?

In page 40, he says, "This reformer of abuses has declared publicly that he would prove the amount of my income." He then goes on right eloquently, and, in a rich vein of acrimony, says, that he has never given me such information: "where then does this man get his information of people's fortunes?" and enlarges on "prying into family concerns;" or "did he go to the tax-gatherer with his pencil in his hand? Is this his respect for individual independence and freedom from the odious annoyance of impertinent curiosity? Is a man's house no longer to be his castle?"*

This, to be sure, is very pretty talk, (even if his insinuations were true,) for one whose relatives have so long subsisted on those inquisitorial taxes by which Englismen's houses have long ceased to be their castles; from one who is still looking towards the taxes, as will presently appear, by having his children fitted at the public expence for statesmen, chancellors, and bishops. The plain tale I have to tell will be my best vindication. The value of church livings is tolerably well known in most parishes, without having recourse to those methods at which he seems so indignant; in the parish of Edmonton particularly so. A few years ago, under an inclosure act, a corn rent was given to the Vicar in lieu of tythes, and free from parochial

---

* Mr. Warren says that I stated in the Common-Council, that he made £500 by his potatoes. What I stated was, that it had just been intimated to me, (while in my speech,) by a member to whose friend Mr. Warren told it, that he had last year made £400 of his potatoes.

rates, of course an estimate must have been made; and it is generally known, throughout the parish, that the corn rents alone produce 829l. per ann.; besides which, he has a house and thirty acres of land: every one may nearly tell the value of the land. There are nearly five hundred parishioners who pay to the rates: a tolerable estimate may therefore be made of the Easter offerings, the surplice fees, and the freehold of the churchyard. Without asking a question, I have heard the income stated at 1200l. per ann. fifty times, and often at more. The Rev. Gentleman has now my sources of information. I have been informed, that he stated his income to the Committee of Governors at 800l.: I hope he stated the truth. Let it be even that sum, it makes nothing against my argument. I contend, that no man with that income has a claim upon the charity. He has not however any where in his pamphlet denied that his income is 1200l. per annum.

In page 41, the Rev. Gentleman returns to the subject, and says, "I again say *that the claim for my child's admission, is an unexceptionable one.* The Committee is to be assured that the parents of the child so admitted have not the means of educating and *providing* for it;" and then continues, "neither is it meant to say, that there are altogether wanting the means of paying the expence of schooling in early life: the very words, *provided for*, indicate clearly a different meaning. They do not look to the present moment, so much as a far more important, as well as expensive care of finishing a youth's education." Wonderful! I had said, he had overlooked all the rules, certificates, &c. but he has found one word to suit his purpose, "*provided for!*" Has God so blinded his eyes, and darkened his understanding, that he cannot pereeive; or is this a wilful perversion? Pray turn to the words contained in the rules stated in my letter, page 21, and try whether they can be tortured into such a meaning.

"It is for this purpose (he continues) that a man, even if he has my income, yet at the same time has eight children, of whom five are girls, may TRULY AND CONSCIENCIOUSLY *say, that he has not in his own purse, the adequate means of expenditure.*"

Good God! what a perversion of reason again, or something worse. According to this mode of reasoning, where is there a man who has a fortune of forty thousand pounds who may not fancy himself a proper object? Does it follow that a man must leave all his children independent fortunes? A man may say, you must consider the stile I have always lived in, although I have forty thousand pounds, when divided among ten children, it is only four thousand each; as a prudent man, I ought to avail myself of some charitable institution, to maintain and educate some of them.

I beg again to refer you to my second letter, page 21, and beg your particular attention to the lines in Italics, you will observe, that the Rev. Gentleman signs in a double capacity, not only as a petitioner, "*praying their worships, in their usual pity and compassion to* DISTRESSED MEN, POOR WIDOWS, AND FATHERLESS CHILDREN, *to admit his child into their said charity, there to be educated* AMONG OTHER POOR CHILDREN," but he also as minister signs the certificate, wherein he declares, "*that he knows of no* PROBABLE *means for the education of the said child, unless the governors of Christ's Hospital should admit him into the said Hospital*;" and this, in page 41, he has asserted a man in his circumstances *may truly and conscientiously do.* I am really at a loss to know what it is that a man may not do. Now the other persons who have so conscientiously signed this certificate, are the present Churchwardens of Edmonton, whom the Vicar has been so conscientiously supporting on a late occasion. One of these Churchwardens Mr. Young, resides wholly on his fortune, has had two children in

Christ's Hospital himself, one of whom is there at the present time; and these children were placed there by a near relation, a late member of the Common Council. The governors who are so by virtue of their office, as Common Council, I need hardly say, hold it as a trust; and ought not to use it either for their own benefit, or the benefit of rich relations.

Mr. Warren next states, that "His income is a life-in-"terest: it will terminate at his death, and his numerous "children would be then left in a situation in which even "Mr. Waithman would allow them to be proper objects of "the so often mentioned charity." Does it follow, of absolute necessity, that when Mr. Warren dies, he must leave his children destitute of support.

Should they however be left in that situation, they would certainly be proper objects. But Mr. Warren is, I believe, now under forty years of age. He became Vicar of Edmonton, I have understood, when not above twenty-four years of age; and as it has been stated that he has effected a considerable insurance on his life, it can hardly be imagined his family would be left destitute. But let it be asked, is Mr. Warren, before that necessity arrives, and when he may live long and provide well for them—is he, by anticipation, to avail himself of those charitable funds designed for the destitute only, under the mere probability of such an event?—He says his is only a life-interest. Let me ask, have the greater part of persons in trade any thing more? Have they even that? Does not fluctuation in trade, frauds, change of fashions, obstructions in foreign intercourse, often instantly deprive them of the means of supporting themselves and families? But are all such persons, by anticipating these events, to seek provision for their children from a charity, upon which they have no claim until the

event has actually taken place? and would not such persons have much better pretensions for so doing than the Rev. Gentleman? In short, would the Rev. Gentleman's mode of exculpating himself be a satisfactory answer to the commissioners of the property tax, should they call for a tenth of his income?

Mr. Warren says, "can it be supposed, that situated as I "am, I can give my child those advantages at a time "when with every possible œconomy, a young man can "hardly remain at one of the universities, without an "expenditure of at least 200l. per annum:" Why then should he be sent there at all, any more than my sons, or the sons of others, if he cannot afford to pay it? Oh, but Mr. Warren himself was there, and his son should be brought up in the same manner! Well then was Mr. Warren so brought up, and turned into the world penny-less? Had he nothing until he obtained the Vicarage? Has he acquired nothing since? And will it not be at least eight or ten years before he can incur this expence? And will he really assert that he has no prospect of meeting this expence when the time arrives?

Does not Mr. Warren well know that the incomes of persons in trade are much more precarious than his own? Their property continually at risk, and their life a life of drudgery compared to his? That they love their children as well? That they are equally anxious for their advancement in life, and have as good a right to send them to the university as himself? Does he not consider that if the boy possesses talents, his acquirements are equivalent to stock in trade? That to qualify a boy for an eligible business, requires a large premium, besides his maintainance, and a capital before he can commence for himself? Where then, for God's sake, is Mr. Warren's case deserv-

ing of more consideration than mine or others? I have had a larger family than himself, yet I should have despised myself had I solicited such a thing for any of my children, much less signed that degrading petition and certificate.

But who has a right to scrutinize into his private property? The moment he solicits charity,—the moment he describes himself as a poor distressed man, without even the probable means of supporting and educating his own child, he gives that right, and before he is relieved out of a public fund, every circumstance should be enquired into, and strictly ascertained.

I must now, owing to the indirect course the Rev. Gentleman has taken, go back to page 22 in his pamphlet, where he notices the proceedings in Common Council, "Mr. Waithman (says he) proceeds to reproach you for "not giving your presentation to a poor man he had "heard of, (and of course I hope relieved) who had eight "children, and had a distress put into his house for the poor "rates, I dare say this had a very pretty effect in his "speech! if this story be true, it disgraces the officer who "could sue for the warrant of distress, the magistrate "who could grant it, and the neighbourhood which could "not relieve such a case:" he then says "this may be added "to the ingenious inventions intended to embellish his ora-"tion,—*but if there was such a man is it my duty, when a fa-"vourable opportunity offers of benefiting my family, to go round "the country to search for some one who wants it more?*"

Nothing surely can more strongly expose the want of feeling and humanity, than the contemptuous comment contained in the whole of the above passage. Mr. Warren has indeed such fertility of invention, that it is highly natural for him to conceive others may embellish their

representations by the same means ; but this is unfortunately no invention. The poor man's name is Baker: he had then eight children, and his wife lying-in, and now I believe ten children. He has a few acres of ground which he cultivates, and labours as hard as any man in the parish. Mr. Warren says, " If the story be true, *it disgraces the officer who sued for the distress.*" I have not, nor do I now say so. I believe, as this man rented land, and was assessed, the officer might do no more than his duty. He will not attribute to me, I hope, any desire to screen the officer: the officer certainly was Mr. Mellish himself. I again say in the exercise of his duty I do not blame him: he could not, I presume, have been fully acquainted with his situation. All I have said, and do now say, is, that it was extraordinary that this man, and others as deserving, should have been overlooked, and the presentation given to the Vicar. The officer who had the warrant of distress, saw too much distress there already, and instead of putting it into execution, put his hand into his pocket and relieved him. Mr. Warren says sneeringly, " He hoped I relieved him," and yet in the same breath he says, " *It was not his duty to neglect a favourable opportunity of benefiting his family, to look about for some one who wants it more,*" quite forgetting that his Divine Master " *went about doing good,*" and remembering only that " charity begins at home." He need not however look about much: he is surrounded with objects; and as he attends most of the Committees at the workhouse, at which the names of those in arrear are called over, previous to being summoned, it is most likely this man's case came before him. " But no," says Mr. Warren, " it is not necessary to give to such persons' children an education calculated to form the admiral, the statesman, the merchant, and the divine." No! certainly not; nor is the education given in Christ's Hospital so intended, although there are examples of those who, by dint

of genius and application, have become high ornaments to the institution and to the country. And let men who are looking to such things for their children, pay for their education, and not rob the poor "fatherless children" of what of right belongs to them. "But," says Mr. Warren, "this case (the poor man alluded) must be added to the list of ingenious inventions." If there be a list, where is it? He has not yet shewn one invention, except his own; in what an uncomfortable situation must he then have placed himself, by these assertions and insinuations? "This same poor man," Mr. Warren says, "has the means of relief, if his pride does not oppose our parochial establishments." Well forgive him: it is an honest English pride, to maintain his family by the sweat of his brow. Would to God Mr. Warren had some small portion of this pride. I think he would never have put his hand to that degrading petition and certificate.

The advocates for abuse continually cry, this institution is not intended for the lower orders: there are parish schools for them. Who has ever contended that it was? Can we not avoid one extreme without falling into another? It is intended and adapted, and ought to be most rigidly applied for the support and education of those children only who are left destitute of the means of obtaining, or whose parents have not the means of giving them an education suitable to their own condition in life; more strictly speaking, decayed citizens of London. There can be no objection to the sons of clergymen whose situation may require it; but be it remembered, there are institutions distinctly appropriated to that laudable purpose.

He observes, "Mr. Waithman says, that, but for his notice of the occurrence a year ago, I should have another child in Christ's Hospital: he must not flatter himself, *that his notice has occasioned the slightest change in my sentiments and wishes: my second son is not yet old enough*; *when*

he is, I shall, unless some good reasons shall occur to render inexpedient, exert my utmost endeavours to obtain for him the same excellent education." Gracious God! what a declaration! One would have thought the folly and indiscretion of such a declaration, to give it no other name, would have repressed it. I was before led to doubt the correctness of my information, and expected the Rev. Gentleman would have placed this " in the list of my ingenious inventions." But if the notice taken of the transaction has had no operation on his mind, does he imagine the governors are equally callous? Will Mr. Mellish give him another presentation? And if his claim is so fair and just, why is he so outrageous at the exposure?

It was a few weeks only before I heard of Mr. Warren's child being placed in this charity, that I heard a charity sermon preached at Edmonton church, to a crowded congregation, from this remarkable text, " Take this child, and nurse it for me."

The preacher, the Rev. Dr. Draper, made a most affecting discourse. There were few of his hearers but what shed tears, and I believe the Vicar himself, while he described in the most pathetic terms the irresistible claims which all the needy and destitute had upon us. He often emphatically repeated his text, as an imperative demand upon us to perform this duty to the best of our ability, and added that even the widow's mite was called for on such an occasion. What surprise, astonishment, and indignation, must every one have felt, with these impressions remaining on his mind, to find that this child of the Vicar's was put in a public charity to be nursed for him, instead of the poor helpless child of want who had neither parent nor friend to perform this necessary office for it; and now to hear him avow his intentions of soliciting for another, must outrage the feelings of the most obdurate.

Mr. Warren observes, " Mr. Griffiths supported the

mover, and asserted that every part of his statement was true," and expresses his sorrow that Mr. Griffiths should have quoted Sir William Curtis's opinion as to the impropriety of his son's admission, and believes Sir William regrets it still more. I believe, however, he feels no sorrow on the occasion. Mr. Warren says, he has been to Sir William to know whether he gave any authority for so doing; but while he disavowed giving any authority for the use of his name, "*he allowed that he had advanced such an opinion in private conversation,* AND HE STILL MAINTAINED IT." What I have heard twenty times is, that after the publication of the letter, an active and respectable governor on the Committee waited on Sir William to inquire into the truth of it, and Sir William, highly to his credit, declared him a very unfit and improper object. He then states, that Sir William Curtis has obliged him to levy at great expence, and in spite of appeals which he has successively made to different courts, the trifling sum of 10l. but without any personal difference; in the same manner, I suppose, that the Rev. Gentleman could dispute with his parishioners, and commence actions, without ever being at variance with them. This is certainly very meek and christian-like.

Mr. Warren says, in page 27, "that he is told the institution was not designed for his, but for the children of decayed citizens, of that truly pitiable class of men, who have seen better days. "Had the son of a freeman of London, (he continues,) who had been reduced from affluence and comfort, presented his claim in competition with mine, I have no doubt but you (Mr. Mellish) would have given him your presentation. I am certain I should have said, here is the more immediate object of your institution, I will not stand in his way, *but apply to some other quarter. But I am told, the funds of this noble establishment have been so increased, that it was impossible to consume its revenues on the objects for which it, strictly speaking, was intended.*"

What disgusting cant and hypocrisy!—" He would " have given way for such an object," but mark him well, " *He would have applied to some other quarter.*" I had received a letter, stating that the writer had solicited Mr. Mellish at the very time, for the son of a disceased liveryman of London, what an unfortunate friend has Mr. Mellish, in Mr. Warren,—well might he have exhorted him to be silent,—but " he will be talking," as Dogberry says. He now too confesses what he has been throughout his pamphlet contending against, the charity is diverted from the purposes for which it was intended. " *But he says the* " *funds are so increased, proper objects are not to be found*;" is the Rev. Gentleman devoid of common sense? With the list of governors before him, does he not know that they amount to between three and four hundred? That each has a presentation every three years? And does not the immence population of the metropolis furnish above one hundred and thirty or forty objects, which is the number annually admitted? Give me leave to say there are thousands of such pitiable objects. For even a coal or corn meters place in the gift of the corporation, worth about 100l. per ann, I have myself had one hundred and twenty applications from decayed citizens, stating their distressed situation, and unprovided offspring; since I have interfered in this business I have had numerous applications, under an idea that I had some interest: they had applied to various governors, all of whom were engaged, often has it been said, " dear madam do you know the value of what you are asking for?" How can the Vicar then make such assertions? Does he not know that he had himself made repeated solicitations to several governors? Some of whom too, who could hold no " social intercourse with those who could vote for, or countenance the motion of censure upon Mr. Mellish," who nevertheless condemned this transaction. I appeal to the Rev. Gentleman whether the majority, if not all of his own friends, have

not unequivocally condemned his conduct. Does he not know that there are hundreds of poor distressed clergymen who are in want of such provision for their children? How then can he snatch the morsel of bread from such deplorable objects, and remain insensible to the moral and religious terpitude of such conduct? And even vauntingly boast of his intention of getting another child placed in the same charity.

Mr. Warren says, page 44, " You know Sir, upon the " authority of one of the governors, that previous to my " son's admission, his admissability had been strictly can- " vassed by the Committee of governors, and that there " were only three that objected to it," Mr. Warren then imagines that he had a " right to conclude from the cla- " mours since raised, that these gentlemen left no argu- ments unimployed, no endeavours untried to enforce their objections;" I believe no such thing, nor that Mr. Warren has a right to draw any such conclusions; what I have understood was, that his admission was objected to by these three gentleman, and that considerable doubt re- mained with the rest of the Committee, that after the mat- ter had been stated before the public, further inquiries were made, and as I am informed the govenor alluded too, has stated, that they all concurred in his being an improper object, but did imagine that Mr. Warren would have withdrawn him.

It has been industriously stated, that I have been ex- cited by resentment against Mr. Mellish, because he refused an application which I made to him for a presentation. This is a direct falshood; I never solicited a favor of any kind from Mr. Mellish in the whole course of my life. I have applied to several govenors for a presentation for a child every way qualified, but chiefly since this affair, but without any prospect at present of obtaining one; although Mr. Warren tells us proper objects are not to be found.

I fear I have detained my readers too long, in answering matters hardly worthy of attention, all the material assertions (for as to arguments, they are not deserving the name) I trust I have compleatly refuted, and although Mr. Warren has charged me and those honorable men who voluntarily supported me, with "the mutilation and misrepresentation of facts, to which (he says, page 47) he has opposed "facts themselves," yet I challenge and defy Mr. Warren or any one else, to shew that I have any where stated what is not true, and have not disproved mostly out of his own mouth, all the representations which he has made, and as to his opposing to us facts themselves, he has totally passed over all the facts, stated in my letters and public declarations; and if reasoning it must be called he has reasoned only on his own fanciful notions.

In page 47, Mr. Warren has highly complimented himself, and although he has been continually engaged in disputes and contentions with his Parishioners, ever since I have known the parish; and during the late poll, when 152 voted against the scheme for erecting walls and cells, for the confinement of the poor, against 85 who supported Mr. Warren and the officers, he shewed such a restless anxiety during the contest, as to be seldom from the poll book; on one occasion, when he eagerly came to the book saying, "how many *have we* polled to day," he was seasonably reproved by a gentleman then present, who thus addressed him, "We, sir, are not you the shepherd of the whole flock;" yet he has never had a difference with them, and those habits of *social intercourse* he can oppose to the "utmost efforts of Mr. Waithman's malice of his personal animosity to him, and of his hatred to the religious and political institutions of his country."

Mr. Warren after making these unqualified assertions, proceeds to consider himself as libeled, and that the persons have rendered themselves amenable to the laws of

the country; in that case I should certainly not look for much forbearance from him. Is he not however aware that to assert that a man has a "hatred to the religious and political institutions of the country," is a libel of the most wicked and attrocious nature? Is he not aware that while looking for a "mote in his brother's eye," he has a "beam in his own."

Can any thing more wanton, more reprehensible, be conceived than the conduct of the Rev. Gentleman, in making so infamous, so unfounded a charge, without a shadow of proof; one single fact which can rationally account for my enmity to him, or my hatred of the religious and political institutions of my country? Had I, like Mr. Warren's relations been living on the public taxes, did I or any part of my family gain 1200l. per ann. out of our church establishment, had I meanly stooped to solicit and obtain for my children education and maintainance out of those public charities designed for "the poor and needy of "Christ's flock," I should then, in his opinion, be a friend to our religious and political institution, and worthy his "social intercourse." According to Mr. Warren's notions no man can love the constitution but those who live upon the labour of the people! No one can love our church establishment but those who subsist on its emoluments! No one can be friendly to public charity, but those whose children are supported out of its funds! No, I have no hatred for these establishments, it is the scandalous and shameful abuses which I hate, and against which my heart shall ever be indignant, and against which my voice shall ever be raised;

"If I corruption's hand expose,
"I make corrupted men my foes."

I hate to see rich benifices bestowed on mere boys from college, as marriage portions with their wives, worth 1200l, per ann. while I see learned honest pious men pining in want, at an advanced age upon a wretched curacy, and even those charitable institutions designed for their

helpless children, filled with the children of the indolent and mercenary, wallowing in plenty; I hate to see a croud of shallow empty coxcombs, living on those public taxes which are wrung from the people, by that prying inquisitoral system the Rev. Gentleman complains of. Had I cast my eye upon these things, I might have long since obtained them, and enjoyed that Gentleman's "social intercourse," as a good friend to church and state; but in no part of my life, so open to public observation and misrepresentation, can he affix any imputation of selfish or interested motives.

"I scorn to flatter
"A blown-up fool above, to crush the wretch beneath me."

GENTLEMEN,

However I may desire to stand well in the opinion of a most respectable body of men, I should have relied on the general tenor of my public conduct, and patiently submitted to any opinion you might have formed respecting me, whether favorable or otherwise, had I not conceived that by raising an unfounded prejudice against my motives, the great object of a reformation of acknowledged abuses, might have been at least in some degree impeded. It has been impressed upon you, that I had cast unmerited imputations on the conduct of the governors, and endeavours have been made to raise a jealously between them and the corporation of London; I trust that such jealously will never exist, much less impede necessary and due enquiry. I know that these abuses have crept in imperceptibly, I know that governors have been frequently and scandalously imposed upon; some may have been mistaken as to the real object of the institution, and very few I hope have erred through design; although I trust sufficient checks will be established to prevent every abuse in future, I am very far from desiring that errors or inadvertences should be too severely scrutinized, much less that imputations should be thrown on those who may have been imposed upon.

What I ardently hope is, that those presentations which evidently militate against the real design of the charity should be properly investigated, and effectual measures adopted for the prevention of all abuses in future. Should my humble efforts conduce to these ends, it will be an ample gratification to me, although I should be deprived of the feligious edification, the moral instruction, and the sympathetic feelings for real distress and misery, which I might otherwise have enjoyed from the "social intercourse" of the Rev. Dawson Warren.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient humble servant,

ROBERT WAITHMAN.

Winchmore Hill, Edmonton,
November 30, 1808.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since this work was sent to press, a General Meeting of the governors of Christ's Hospital has been held, (the 2d of December,) in consequence of the resolution unanimously agreed to by a Court of Common-Council. A motion, I understand, was made for appointing a Committee of Governors to *inquire* into the alledged abuse, and also other similar abuses; and, strange to tell, at a numerous meeting, where one hundred and twenty governors were supposed to be present, *not above seven hands were held up for an inquiry.* How can this be accounted for? In the Common-Council there are thirty-eight members who are governors of Christ's Hospital by virtue of their office. In the Common-Council, at a full court, where it is also supposed one hundred and fifty members were present, *it passed unanimously.* Some few and very faint objections were made: they were replied to, and died away. How the governors could resist such an inquiry—upon what principle of reason, justice, common sense, or common feeling, is beyond my comprehension. I am told, one ground of objection was, that it would be a reflection on the Committee of Governors who are invested with the management, and that they were either then making, or would make, the necessary inquiries. The alledged abuses have been made public nearly a year and a half, and I am not aware of any effectual inquiry or reformation which has taken place.—Whether the statements made be true or false, is not inquiry equally necessary, in either case? If true, they call loudly for reformation; if false, inquiry would vindicate the Committee and Governors at large from unfounded aspersions. To the Com-

mittee themselves, inquiry ought in such a case to be highly desirable; nay insisted upon,

> " The steward whose account is clear,
> " Demands his honour may appear."

Does not then this refusal to go into inquiry, confirm the truth of these alledged abuses? Does it not afford too much ground for apprehension that the evil is too widely spread? That, in fact, not one fifth part of the boys are fit and proper objects; that the governors themselves shrink from inquiry, fearful it might affect their presentations, and lead to the expulsion of the children? Is it possible to account for this refusal of inquiry in any other way? One numerous body, in which are thirty-eight governors, unanimously concur in its necessity: another body, consisting wholly of governors, (excepting seven or eight,) decline entering into it. Would it be possible to find one hundred and fifty persons who are not governors or interested, in any part of the kingdom, out of whom seven persons would deny the necessity of inquiry?

It is not Mr. Warren's case alone to which I look; he happened only to be the one first hit. But Mr. Warren has complained of misrepresentation. Ought not then Mr. Warren himself, instead of circulating his pamphlet gratis among the governors, and getting his friends to oppose inquiry,—ought he not, I say, if conscious as he says of being a proper object, to seek and even demand inquiry.

Instead of which, a most profound and luminous Alderman of London,* a near neighbour and friend of his, and being himself with the same " saving knowledge blessed," with that pure and native eloquence which alike baffles all the powers of description, and bids defiance to all the vulgar rules of art, drew a most woeful picture of this "*poor*

* Ald. Christopher Smith.

distressed man's" piteous case. Quite overpowered in the affecting narrative, he

" Told the sad story,
" And twenty times made pause to sob and weep,
" That all the standers by had wet their cheeks
" Like trees bedash'd with rain."

" In faith, 'twas strange! 'twas passing strange!
" 'Twas pitiful! 'twas wond'rous pitiful!!!"

He stated that his income was *only* 800l. per ann.; that his farming account was a losing one; and *he described his life to be in such a precarious state, that he could not in any office effect an insurance upon it.*

I have represented Mr. Warren's income at 1200l. per annum. I have heard his corn rents alone stated over and over again, upon the authority of the person who collected them, at 829l. To this grand item of profit, are to be added his house, garden, and thirty acres of land, for which I know farmers who would give 4l. per acre.

It is evident, the sagacious alderman left this out of the account in his estimate as a losing concern. If Mr. Warren chooses to hold the land himself, and loses by bad management, what is that to the purpose? There are still the acres, for which he may have the money. There are besides the Easter offerings and surplice dues. Let all these be taken into the account, and let it be decided whether my estimate of 1200l. per ann. be too high.

With respect to Mr. Warren's life, he may labour under some complaint, and may still reach a very advanced age. To all appearance, (for his comfort I speak it,) he seems as likely now to live twelve years, as he did twelve years ago. How could the worthy alderman then make such an assertion? Was it it for the purpose, as Mr. Warren would call it, of " embellishing his oration?" I call most seriously upon him to say, whether Mr. Warren had

not previously effected a very considerable insurance upon his life; and whether he did not know this at the very time he made the assertion? Nay, more, I will ask, whether, in estimating his income, (besides the omission of several items,) he did not deduct the sum annually paid by Mr. Warren for such insurance? As well may a man do so, who lays out annually 200l. per ann. in the stocks as a fund for his children. It will be observed, nothing has here been said about his private fortune; all this is taking it for granted, that he never possessed any. Five or six acres, however, of the above land, is freehold, which he purchased.

If the Committee of Governors really go into an inquiry, which I think cannot be looked for, and a reformation of existing abuses be effected, they shall have my unfeigned gratitude: if not, as I trust I have made it appear that every citizen is interested, I shall be ready to join any of my fellow citizens in an application to the Chancellor, should the Corporation of London refuse to seek such remedy.

JOHN ABRAHAM, PRINTER, CLEMENT'S LANE.